UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Wilfred Owen, Soldier and Pacifist!

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Leo Tolstoy

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Where Words Fail, Deeds Speak

By ARTHUR B. HEEB

Centralization of Power in France and Japan

By DAVID STARR JORDAN

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 18

Chicago, June 30, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 275
Wilfred Owen, Soldier and Pacifist!—John Haynes Holmes 277

CONTRIBUTED—

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. VI. Leo Tolstoy.—George Willis Cooke 279
Where Words Fail, Deeds Speak.—Arthur B. Heeb 281
Centralization of Power in France and Japan.—David Starr Jordan 282

SELECTED—

The Co-operative Movement and World Problems.—*E. D. Morel* 283

THE STUDY TABLE—

"The Lost Oracles."—Contributor 286
Social Legislation.—Susan Quackenbush 286

POETRY—

At Night.—*Laura Spencer Porter* 275
Hope.—James Hugh Keeley 279

THE FIELD—

How We Won Equal Suffrage in South India.—*Dorothy Jinarajadasa* 287

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1921 Number 18

AT NIGHT.

Is my heart ordered, clean, and sweet,
For my loved Master's hasting feet?

Is my heart warm, that, when He stands
Chilled, He may stoop and warm his hands?

And quiet that he may be blest—
Tired from all turmoil—and have rest?

And lighted, that He may forget
The rough road, and the storm and wet?

Garnished with flagrant flowers, that might
Recall dear joys across black night?

And is there bread? and wine? lest He
Should thirst—or should be hungry?

Hark! Who is there? Oh, enter in!
Enters a man bowed down with sin.

Behind him, bent, is one who stands,
A broken heart within her hands;

And back of them (oh, shut the wild
Night out!) a shrinking starvèd child.

* * * * *

A step! O Master do not wake
Thy friends who sleep here for thy sake!

Disturb them not, O Mighty Guest!
They sleep! They have such need of rest!

The Master smiles, then He and I
Go softly; speak but whisperingly.

Atlantic Monthly. —*Laura Spencer Porter.*

These are the days when it is becoming increasingly difficult to give expression to our religious emotions by the accustomed methods of public worship. As the days grow longer and the sun adds warmth to its beams, as the birds sing and the air becomes fragrant with the roses, we find ourselves thinking of our fathers who, like Adam in the Garden, lived in the open. For we were not always city folk—only recently have we had homes and shelters. In the beginning, and for unnumbered thousands of years in the past, as Mr. Wells has reminded us in his "Outline," men were out-of-doors creatures, like the birds of the air and the beasts of the field. They lived on plains or by the seashore, hid in the shadows of caves or under the leafy canopies of trees, watched the darkness of the night and took comfort in the shining of the stars. If they had any religion, it was partly at least that of men who feared the lightning, and received with gratitude the sun and rain. It is the memory of these ancestors which stirs within us at this season of the year. Our fathers are awake again, their blood is leaping quick within our veins! Our cities, with their streets and walls and crowded throngs of people, become intolerable to us. A roof over our head is as unwelcome as the conventional clothing upon our backs. The dark and musty spaces of our churches seem to shut God out rather than to contain him, and we crave the worship of one who lives in sky and sea and mountain. It is no wonder that Sunday congregations begin to diminish at this season of the year. Churches should be kept open always; but if their aisles and corridors are no longed thronged, we may take solace in the thought that there is a religion of the open air as devout and holy as the religion of the builded cathedral and the glowing altar.

While waiting for a train in Albany, N. Y., the other day, we strolled to the capitol on the hill. On the way we were struck by the extraordinary number of recruiting posters which lined the streets. The marines were especially popular—and what happy lives they lived on ship-board; all play and no work, if the pictures were to be trusted! Arrived at the capitol, we were greeted by the heroic equestrian statue of General Sheridan, by the famous sculptor, J. Q. A. Ward—a superb soldier, superbly mounted! Climbing the long flight of steps, we came to the entrance hall of the building, and straightway were lost in a jungle of war-relics. Here were battle-flags of the Civil War, the Spanish War and the World War; glass cases laden with uniforms, swords, guns, shells, knapsacks, etc.; pictures of distinguished generals and other officers; and cannon enough to compose a battery of artillery. Leaving the capitol after due inspection of these mementoes, we heard the sound of fife and drum, and saw a regiment of boys from a near-by military academy, marching in full dress array. In sheer despair, we sought the Education Building, one of the noblest edifices in the state, but turned back when we saw the flaring announcement that "Moving Pictures of the World War" were to be shown that evening at 8:15 o'clock. "Free to all" was the last line on the poster. Thus do we Americans love peace and hate war! Thus do we use our public resources to teach the rising generation to love peace and hate war! When we left Albany, after this casual visit, we felt that there was about as much chance of preventing "the next war" as of preventing the next eclipse of the sun.

It is a shocking thing to hear that the Secretary of the Navy has declared martial law in Haiti, and thus

placed the people of that unhappy country under the arbitrary control of the marines. Think of a man's being punished for denouncing or even criticizing the occupation of his native land by foreign soldiery! What would we Americans think if German marines, let us say, were occupying our country, and visiting military punishment upon us for daring to speak out in resentment against their presence? Is it impossible, in this case, to get "the other fellow's" point of view, and thus realize that the Haitian, like the American, may love his native land so well as to desire to rule it himself in his own way and to his own ends? For those who cannot see things in this way, we commend a careful reading of the recent "Memoir of the Political, Economic and Financial Conditions Existing in the Republic of Haiti under the American Occupation," published on May 1st last by the delegates to the United States of the Union Patriotique d'Haiti. This was printed in full in the New York *Nation,* and copies may be had on application at the office of the *Nation* (20 Vesey Street, New York City). This "Memoir" reveals a state of affairs comparable to nothing less than the German occupation of Belgium and the English occupation of Ireland. Here our American militarism is in full sway, and practicing the worst that Europe and Asia have ever known. What can equal the shame of such a situation, excepting the shame of what seems to be the utter absence of an American public opinion to demand the ending of this abomination?

Mr. Gompers's recent charge that the blame for the world war is to be placed squarely on the shoulders of organized labor in Germany, is unworthy even of Mr. Gompers. We hold no brief in defense of the action of the labor and Socialist groups in the Kaiser's empire in the crisis of 1914, for we feel exactly as Mr. Gompers does, that they "failed dismally at the critical hour." If they had taken the situation vigorously in hand, as Mr. Gompers suggests, they would indeed have "stopped the war." But why should we charge the German workers with such failure at this time, when the workers in every other country failed in exactly the same way? Are we never going to be able to understand that the average man in Germany felt exactly the same about his country in the hour of war, as the average man in England and America, or in any other country? This average man did not know the facts, was aware of nothing but that his country was calling and he must answer. What happened in England in 1914, and in America in 1917, was exactly the same as what happened in Germany in 1914, so far at least as human emotions are concerned. Were Mr. Gompers a German, as he is an American, and had he been confronted by the crisis in Germany in 1914 as he was confronted by the crisis in America in 1917, he would have acted in identically the same fashion—that is, he would have been a patriot, hot for war and eager to destroy the enemy! This is not to raise the question as to which nation was right or wrong in the war crisis; it is simply to state the fact that the reactions of patriotism are the same the world around. Some day, pray God, this reaction will everywhere be what Mr. Gompers insists it should have been in Germany—namely, the refusal of laboring men everywhere to fight and kill their fellows across the border!

Has the faculty of reason ceased altogether to operate these days? We sometimes think it has, when we still hear persons asserting in book and press and pulpit, that the Bolsheviki are responsible for the economic ruin of Russia. That Russia is ruined, there can be no doubt; critics friendly as well as unfriendly agree to this fact. But is Russia ruined because of the rule of Lenin and the commissars? If so, how does it happen that other and neighboring countries, which know nothing of communism and communists, are in identically the same disastrous plight? Austria is not Bolshevist, but it is the testimony of Brailsford that she is in even a worse condition of collapse than Russia. Poland is hotly anti-Bolshevist, but her ruin is as complete and dire as that of the Soviet areas. Hungary is as "white" as Moscow is "red," but she is dying faster economically than any other country in Europe. Russia suffers today, as these other countries suffer, because of the horror of the Great War, and the equal horror of the so-called Peace. Had the Bolsheviki never come to power, Russia would have been ruined just the same. Lenin and his associates are responsible for many ills; they have made costly mistakes in judgment and policy; there are indications that a regime which has practiced war and tyranny under plea of self-defense, is approaching the doom which sooner or later awaits every government which uses such weapons. But the economic condition of the country has been helped rather than hurt by the communist rule.

Lloyd-George is getting exasperated at the churches! In an address delivered on June 15th, before the General Assembly of the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales, the English Premier issued a general proclamation of "hands off." Speaking of the international situation, he said, "Whether the covenant of the League of Nations is the best organization, or whether an American proposition is more likely to succeed, that is not for the churches to decide." Referring to the interest of the churches in the coal strike, he declared that this was an example of interference by a religious organization in the task of government which if fol-

lowed would be replete with mischief to both church and state. As for the question of Ireland, this, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, was a very proper subject for debates in senates and political gatherings, but it certainly was not a matter for discussion at a religious conference. These are stanzas of a very different song from the one which Lloyd-George was singing years ago at the top of his voice, when he was assailing the Boer War, putting through his great measures of social reform, and stripping the landlords of their ill-gotten possessions. In those days Lloyd-George was rallying the churches to his banner, and teaching them the sound doctrine that any social question involving elementary principles of liberty and justice for the common people was *ipso facto* a religious question. In those days, however, the public conscience was on his side; today, the public conscience exposes him as a tyrant and a charlatan. No wonder that he wants the churches to keep still!

The State of Montana reports a significant example of co-operation between Protestant churches. The story is told by Dr. Clifford Cress in a pamphlet entitled "The Montana Plan of Every-Community Service." It seems that a religious survey of the State conducted by the Home Missions Council presented some startling facts. It was shown that many towns and villages in Montana had no Christian churches of any kind while in others the provision for church services was wholly inadequate. In other communities, on the other hand, the various denominations were overlapping and thus engaged in ruinous competition. The Council proposed, on the basis of the facts revealed by its survey, a program of united action, and this led to a conference of the nine Protestant denominations of importance in the State. This conference, after a careful study of the situation, outlined a plan of co-operative action, and it is this plan which is now being put into effect. It is important to notice that the basis of the plan is the elimination of denominational activity and the organization of co-operative effort on the basis of community life. What we have here in this remarkable achievement is a long first-step in the direction of the community church movement. It may be that Montana will be the first State to work out its whole religious problem on the community basis.

A Chinese scholar, writing in the New York *Times,* declares that he knows of "only one poem written by an American poet which can be truly called a real poem." He explains that he means by "a real poem," a poem "which becomes the spiritual asset of a nation and forms an important part of its civilization." The "one poem" of this kind he names is Edgar Allan Poe's "Annabel Lee"! He then goes on to broaden his statement by affirming that, if America were destroyed tomorrow, the only really spiritual things which would be remembered by men of after generations, would be this poem by Poe and the plantation songs of the Negroes. We think "Annabel Lee," may we say, a beautiful poem; and we count the Negro music of the South among the priceless spiritual possessions of the nation. But none the less we regard this judgment of our Chinese friend as "tommy-rot." What about Lincoln's "Gettysburg Speech" and "Second Inaugural"? Are we to forget or ignore Walt Whitman's "Prayer of Columbia," "The Mystic Trumpeter" and "Passage to India"? Has Emerson contributed nothing to an immortal spiritual heritage? Are Lowell's "Biglow Papers" mere passing satire, and nothing more? America is all too poor in the things of the spirit. We think the Chinese observer is justified in raising the question as to whether we are civilized. But we cannot believe that "Annabel Lee," lovely as it is, exhausts our achievement in the higher realms of experience and imagination.

Wilfred Owen, Soldier and Pacifist!

We conceive it a part at least of the duty which UNITY owes its readers, to acquaint them with every book that presents the gospel of pacifism—the horror, futility and crime of war! Therefore do we name today Wilfred Owen's volume of "Poems," recently published in beautiful memorial form by B. W. Huebsch, New York.

The author was born at Oswestry on the 18th of March, 1893. Educated at Birkenhead Institute and London University, he obtained in 1913 a private tutorship near Bordeaux, and remained there until 1915. In this year, in spite of delicate health, he joined the Artists' Rifles O. T. C., was gazetted to the Manchester Regiment, and served with their 2nd Battalion until June, 1917, when he was invalided home. Fourteen months later he returned to the front, attained to the command of a company, earned the Military Cross for gallantry, and was killed on November 4th, just a week before the signing of the Armistice, while leading his men across the Sambre Canal.

His volume of poems, rightly called by Robert Nichols "a wonderful book," continues the tradition begun by Siegfried Sassoon in his "Counter-Attack" and "Picture Show." It will be remembered that Sassoon, himself a soldier, dedicated his muse to fierce exposure and denunciation of the war which he had tasted so bitterly for the sake of England. He wrote his burning verses in the spirit of his now familiar remark to Robert Nichols—"War is hell and those who institute it are criminals. Were there anything to say for it, it should not be said, for its spiritual disasters far outweigh any of its advantages."

Owen thinks the same, and his poems are the im-

mortal witness of his thought. A month before his death, he wrote his mother—"I came out again in order to help these boys; directly, by leading them as well as an officer can; indirectly by watching their sufferings that I may speak of them as well as a pleader can." In a fragmentary, disordered and yet impressive Preface to his poems, which was found among his papers after his death, he writes—

> This book is not about heroes. . . . Nor is it about deeds or lands, nor anything about glory, honor, dominion or power, *except War.* Above all, this book is not concerned with Poetry. The subject of it is War, and the pity of War. The Poetry is in the pity. Yet these elegies are not to this generation. . . . They may be to the next. All the poet can do today is to warn. That is why the true Poets must be truthful.

There is evidence that the war at first confused Owen. He felt the call of country, was alarmed and horrified by the German invasion of Belgium and France, and enlisted in military service with a fine sincerity. First hand acquaintanceship with the realities of the conflict, however, shook him to the bottom of his soul. More and more he came to feel pity as the dominant emotion of his heart—pity for all men everywhere. "In the last year of his life," writes Siegfried Sassoon, in his Introduction to the volume of Owen's writings, "he attained a clear vision of what he needed to say, and these poems survive him as his true and splendid testament."

The first impression which one receives from this book, as from most books written by men who saw service at the front, is that of the absence of all hatred or rancor against the enemy. Wilfred Owen, like other soldiers, left this ugly business to the stay-at-homes—old men in their clubs, politicians in their parliaments, and ministers in their pulpits. It may not inaccurately be stated that detestation of Germans during the war was like Newton's law of gravitation—it varied inversely as the square of the distance from the front-line trenches. Of all his poems, only one makes mention of the foe. This is the first one in the book, entitled "Strange Meeting." He here pictures himself as escaping "out of the battle," and moving

> Down some profound dull tunnel, long since scooped
> Through granites which Titanic wars had groined.

There, suddenly, "one sprang up and stared"; and the poet says that

> By his smile I knew that sullen hall.

Then follows a long colloquy about war and its grim pity, and at last the confession of this stranger thus so strangely met—

> I am the enemy you killed, my friend.
> I knew you in this dark; for so you frowned
> Yesterday through me as you jabbed and killed,
> I parried; but my hands were loath and cold.
> Let us sleep now . . .

This poem is a fragment found among the author's poems after his death. "It ends on this strange note," says an editorial comment. But surely it is a note as beautiful as it is "strange"!

In his comparison of the soldiers with the stay-at-homes, Owen is as relentless as it is possible for such a tender heart to be. Paying his tribute to his comrades in the trenches—their courage, patience, and miraculous good nature—he says to those safe back in England—

> . . . Except you share
> With them in hell the sorrowful dark of hell,
> Whose world is but the trembling of a flare,
> And heaven but as the highway for a shell,
> You shall not hear their mirth:
> You shall not come to think them well content
> By any jest of mine. *These men are worth*
> *Your tears: You are not worth their merriment.*

His judgment as to the meaning of the Great War, its cause and ultimate spiritual significance, is unmistakeably defined in what he calls a "Parable of the Young Men and the Old." We regard this as one of the most terrific indictments of the conflict which we have ever read:

> So Abram rose, and clave the wood, and went,
> And took the fire with him, and a knife.
> And as they sojourned both of them together,
> Isaac the first-born spake and said, My Father,
> Behold the preparations, fire, and iron,
> But where the lamb for this burnt offering?
> Then Abram bound the youth with belts and straps,
> And builded parapets and trenches there,
> And stretched forth the knife to slay his son.
> When, lo! an angel called him out of heaven,
> Saying, Lay not thy hand upon the lad,
> Neither do anything to him. Behold,
> A ram caught in a thicket by its horns;
> Offer the Ram of Pride instead of him.
> But the old man would not so, but slew his son. . . .

For patriotism of the conventional sort—the "100 per cent American" variety, as we would call it in this country!—Owen has little respect. He sees nothing particularly imperative or glorious in this business of dying for one's country! Taking Horace's famous and almost scriptural phrase, *"Dulce et Decorum Est,"* as the title of one of his poems, he writes of the retirement of a regiment from the front lines. There is a sudden gas attack, and one of the men, slow to adjust his mask, falls "guttering, choking, drowning." Then come these lines—

> If in some smothering dream, you too could pace
> Behind the wagon that we flung him in,
> And watch the white eyes writhing in his face,
> His hanging face, like a devil's sick of sin;
> If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood
> Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs
> Bitten as the cud
> Of vile, incurable sores on innocent tongues,—
> My friend, you would not tell with such high zest
> To children ardent for some desperate glory,
> The old Lie: *Dulce et decorum est*
> *Pro patria mori.*

Wilfred Owen was plainly stricken by the personal suffering incident to modern warfare. There are terrible descriptions in this book, of life in the trenches, battle-scenes, hospitals—with "mental cases," to quote the title of one of the poems, as the crowning horror of all. Knowledge of these facts leads Owen to mince no words when he speaks of what it means for men to march away to war. We remember be-

ing fearfully denounced for likening conscripted soldiers to cattle driven to the slaughter! In his poem entitled "Anthem for Doomed Youth," Wilfred Owen uses exactly this same figure in the opening line, which reads—

What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?

In another poem, called "The Send-Off," he describes the soldiers in "the siding-shed" of the railroad, waiting to entrain for the front, and he says—

Their breasts were stuck all white with wreath and spray,
As men's are, dead.

The poem, "A Terre," is a ghastly statement of "the philosophy of many soldiers," which philosophy finds consolation only in death.

Not worse than ours the existences rats lead—
Nosing along at night down some safe vat,
They find a shell-proof home before they rot.

But even death, met at the front at least, is questionable.

Dead men may envy living mites in cheese,
Or good germs even. Microbes have their joys,
And sub-divide and never come to death.

Best not think on life and death—best not have souls at all!

Soldiers may grow a soul when turned to fronds,
But here the thing's best left at home with friends.

Owen thinks that

Happpy are men who yet before they are killed
Can let their veins run cold . . .
Happy are those who lose imagination . . .
Can laugh among the dying unconcerned.

But he himself is plainly not one of these. His soul is wracked with tortures, and the subject of his book, indeed, "the pity of War"!

It is obvious that this volume of poems could not have been printed during the war—or, if printed, would have been suppressed. There is hope for the world when those who themselves have fought, bear testimony that cannot be allowed to be heard in wartime.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

HOPE.*

Master of pitiless despair am I!
All Fortune's issues on my judgments wait;
Human happiness I guard. I navigate
Rivers and seas remote. All fear defy.
In hut and camp, and halls of court and state,
I stand. I call unsought at every gate.
In work, or rest, or sleep,—attend! The more
In youth, since I control the course of life
Of all who look to me; and, soon or late,
They conquer every fear and sin-bred foe.
The gloom and dread of death I dissipate.
Remorse I bind; and banish sullen woe.
Doubt's hesitating hearts do I restore
To faith and peace and joy, for ever more.

—JAMES HUGH KEELEY.

* Written in answer to J. G. Ingalls's famous sonnet on "Opportunity."

The heart has reasons which the reason does not know. It is the heart that feels God, not the reason. The primary truths are not demonstrable, and yet our knowledge of them is none the less certain. Principles are felt, propositions are proved. Truths may be above reason, and yet not contrary to reason.—*Pascal.*

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

VI.

LEO TOLSTOY.

Leo (Lyov) Tolstoy, 1828-1910, holds his place as the greatest of Russian authors, and as one of the most important and influential of modern writers. No writer has been more widely read and discussed or who has made a deeper impression on his time. This does not mean that his opinions have been generally accepted; but there was something so unique about his teachings, so far removed from all forms of orthodoxy and nationalism, that he has awakened curiosity and interest by the very fact that he held a position, and accepted opinions, quite his own.

Perhaps no better statement of that which Tolstoy has been to his readers has been made than that of Howells, who finds that the reading of him is "like the clasp of a great, warm hand, with the best of a friendly heart in it—the heart of a man who neither looks down upon his fellow-man nor up to him, but meets on the common level of their humanity, and begins at once to live with him in the real things of the soul." Chesterton finds in Tolstoy "a certain ancient kindliness sitting beside the very cradle of the race of man." His English biographer, Aylmer Maude, sees in Tolstoy "a man of extraordinary capacity and sincerity." Roman Rolland declares that never yet has a voice like his resounded throughout Europe. Kropotkin is of the opinion that no man since Rousseau has so profoundly stirred the human conscience as has Tolstoy in his moral writings. Maxim Gorky sees in Tolstoy an embodiment of the Russian nation, with all its limitations. No other man, he thinks, is more worthy of the name genius, none more complicated, contradictory, and great in everything. "For he is, so to say, universally and above all, a man, a man of mankind."

Tolstoy was an idealist and a mystic. His fundamental philosophical idea was that in consciousness man is related to that universal spiritual reality we call God. In man is an inner light, consciousness or intuition, which gives him immediate contact with the source of truth. Maude says that Tolstoy did not believe in a personal God; but, assuredly, he writes as if he did, and all his later life would indicate such a belief. He was something of a pantheist, we must recognize, and that because he was essentially a mystic. He did believe in that Greater Self, in the fashion of the Indians, in which all smaller selves find their existence. At the same time he rejected all theological beliefs, such as Trinity, incarnation, atonement, resurrection, fall of man, individual salvation; as well as the rituals, sacraments, and formal prayers of the church.

As a man of religion Tolstoy accepted no creeds, but maintained that its true meaning consists in living after the manner of Jesus Christ. Conduct, and not faith or belief, was to him the whole substance of religion. As a Christian he accepted the fundamental moral teachings of Jesus, which he summed up as living at peace with all men, having one wife and avoiding all lust, making no promises we cannot fulfil, returning good for evil, and doing no harm to anyone of another country. These statements may be

condensed into non-resistance and never making war; the first a rule for individuals, the second for nations. To these rules might be added that of chastity, which he greatly emphasized in his later years.

Tolstoy made no radical distinction between religion and morality. The ethical life is at the same time the religious life; and all that is not of moral conduct is not truly religious. Tolstoy has often been called a Socialist, but he was so only in the sense that he was a humanitarian, a lover of the peasants, and greatly concerned about securing a better human life on the part of individuals and nations. In fact, he was one of the most pronounced of individualists, believing that all genuine reform must be wrought out in the individual soul. He has been called a nihilist, but this attitude of his may be best defined in calling him a Christian anarchist. As one who would apply directly to life the teachings of Jesus, he had a right to call himself a Christian. In rejecting all governments, all rule by force, every kind of external organization exercising control over human beings, he may be properly described as an anarchist.

Rejecting all use of force, whether on the part of governments by means of soldiers and police, or on the part of individuals by the means of any kind of coercion, Tolstoy was in no sense whatever an anarchist of the deed. Each individual, in his opinion, ought to govern himself; and he ought to be quite free to do so. He would have no compelling of men to act contrary to their own wishes. For this reason he rejected patriotism as that emotion which justifies and upholds governments in using armies to compel men to act against their wills. He condemned war in all its phases, and all the pleas and arguments made in its behalf. Christianity, he maintained, does not justify any war whatever. When men follow Jesus in conduct war will become impossible. No Christian, who is truly such, can uphold the state by military service, paying taxes, voting, or by any acts whatever giving it recognition.

Because the church gives sanction to coercive and warring governments, because it is everywhere linked up with the state in using force, he would have all genuine Christians reject the church as in direct and constant opposition to the teachings of Jesus. The church teaches superstition, credulity and justifies ignorance. What men need is freedom, right to live their own lives, liberty to live the moral life without interference. This means that men shall not be compelled to pay taxes, act as legislators, soldiers or jurymen; and that they shall take no salary, pension or reward from government.

The moral attitude of Tolstoy may be seen from this quotation from "The Slavery of Our Times," one of the most uncompromising of all books in which anarchism is taught:

> The only means to destroy governments is not force, but it is the exposure of this fraud (of patriotism). It is necessary people should understand: first, that in Christendom there is no need to protect the peoples one from another; that all the enmity of the peoples, one to another, is produced by the governments themselves, and that armies are only needed by the small number of those who rule; for the people it is not necessary, but it is in the highest degree harmful. Secondly, it is necessary that people should understand that the discipline which is so highly esteemed by all governments is the greatest of crimes that man can commit, and is a clear indication of the criminality of the aims of governments. Discipline is the suppression of reason and of freedom in man.

Can it be doubted that Tolstoy was largely influenced by the old communal life of the Russian peasants? His altruism, his humanitarianism, his profound interest in the peasants, his conception of that fellowship of men with each other which he found at the heart of all morality, seem to have their origin and motive for being in the peasant *mir,* that communal life of the Russian village which has made the peasants what they are. The soviets, the artels or tradings associations, and the co-operative societies, so characteristic of Russian peasant life, had an emphatic influence on the social theories put forth by Tolstoy. Here was the source of his constructive social conceptions, his idea as to how governments by coercion are to be overcome. His philosophical conceptions and his understanding of the teachings of Jesus gave him his anarchism; but the *mir* and the peasants provided him with what has been called his socialism, his constructive ideas as to how reform is to be brought about.

In no sense was Tolstoy a revolutionist. He was opposed to violence in behalf of a better social order as he was opposed to coercion on the part of governments. Peaceful non-resistance, going to prison and to death rather than commit any act of violence, quiet refusal to take any part in what will be harmful to others, living for others and not for self—these were Tolstoy's methods of bringing about the changes he felt to be greatly desirable. In a word, reform within, making right one's own soul, being in harmony with God and his will, living as Jesus taught, this was the way to any genuine and permanent reform.

In large degree Tolstoy held to an ascetic conception of life. He saw clearly the evils of the life lived by his own class, and desired to get rid of them by repudiating luxury, property, vice of all kinds, and the customs obtaining in good society. His living as a peasant, working with the toilers on his estate, his cobbling of shoes, his wearing of the peasant dress, all indicate the trend of his mind to an extreme asceticism. For many years he sought to give his property to the peasants, who had produced it; but he was restrained from so doing by his family. His aiding in taking the census in Moscow brought him into immediate contact with the poverty, the wretchedness and the misery of a large section of the people of that city, and wrought in him a great moral change. It emphasized his hatred for all governments, and their failure to care for the people they ruled. His work in the famine period brought him into closer relations with the peasants, and taught him that the famine was directly the product of government, and its failure to do what was within its power to accomplish. These experiences confirmed Tolstoy in his theories as to the causes of human misery, the manner in which it may be alleviated and finally done away with.

One of the most interesting of Tolstoy's books is that entitled "What is Art?" Here he gave expression to his interest in the peasants, and his conviction that all art, all religion, and all morality as well as all government, can be best developed by the common people. The governing class rides on the backs of the peasants, and is not willing to get down from that position of advantage. They live in idleness and luxury, they live by means of force, and they utterly fail to express so much as the true meaning of art. Art becomes to them what is artificial, pedantic, luxurious. The traditions of art, its ideal standards, its critical assumptions, are all based on the life of lux-

ury and artificiality of those who are supported by the peasants. The only remedy for this situation is to return to nature, to a genuine recognition of what is human, to an acceptance of what is normal in living. "Universal art," says Tolstoy, "has a definite and indubitable internal criterion—religious perception; upper-class art lacks this, and therefore the appreciators of that art are obliged to cling to some external criterion."

The real meaning of art is that it infects the beholder or the hearer with the feelings of the artist when he is producing his art-work. What he has seen or heard that enters into his soul, that is, into his emotional life, he conveys to those who seek to understand and appreciate his work. Unless he can infect his appreciators with genuine human feelings for the beautiful, the natural, the genuine, he has failed in being a true artist. The infection he produces is unnatural and unhealthful, and his work is harmful. In a word, according to Tolstoy, all art must be religious and it must be moral. Art for the sake of art is always harmful. It is a mistake to assume that Tolstoy desired that all art should be brought to the standard of the life of the peasant or that he assumed it could be created only by them. To his mind, art must be human, representing all classes of those who lived normal and natural lives; and that its appeal must always be to what is deepest in the life of mankind.

The work of Tolstoy as a writer of fiction cannot be ignored. His "War and Peace," and his "Anna Karenina" have an epic breadth and power which give them an enduring place in modern literature. His peasant stories have an appeal which has won for them a wide reading in many lands. The appeal of his ethical writings has been surpassed by no writer of his time. Perhaps he is more widely known, more intimately discussed, than any other author of the later decades of the nineteenth century. He has been a prophet to his time, an arouser of the consciences of men, a mighty religious teacher, one calling his age from what was artificial to what was genuine. He has created no new religion; he has established no fresh ethical system; he has led the way to no type of government which can be accepted among men. His appeal to the individual has made such revolutionary changes as the result of his life quite impossible. He was too much the critic to have developed great constructive powers. He was too much opposed to the evolutionary processes of his time to have been able to lead in any broad-reaching process of change and reconstruction. Nevertheless, he has been a voice to be heard, its message weighed, and its admonitions heeded. Great has been his word for his time, and for all times to come.

The first translations of Tolstoy's works into English were made from the French, therefore the manner of spelling his name which has been frequently adopted, and is still persisted in by many of those who write about him. Since the Russian alphabet differs largely from the English, it is difficult to transliterate Russian names into our language with literalness. Tolstoy, when he wrote in English, as may be seen in the books of Aylmer Maude, spelled his name with a *y* at the end. A man may be assumed to know how to spell his own name, and *his* manner of spelling it ought to be authoritative and final.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

Where Words Fail, Deeds Speak

"Words hinder," said a little boy of Quaker ancestry, when his mother was lecturing him for some boyish negligence. Words do hinder. The liberal pulpit has come to the turn of the road where the point of this little boy's insight comes home.

A number of liberal ministers have found how much the sublime words of the Sermon on the Mount have hindered. Late in 1917 Dr. Willard A. Paul, a member of the Association to Abolish War, proposed to print the Sermon on the Mount, without note or comment, for free distribution. The secretary of this association was officially informed that such a procedure would be regarded by the Department of Justice as "Pro-German." Would the reading of these passages in the churches from the Gospel of Matthew be looked upon in the same way? And how are they treated now? Are they mere words?

The liberal pulpit has undergone a change. If liberalism in religion meant anything, it meant that deeds, not creeds, were of first importance. Choosing between Cæsar or Christ meant deeds, not words. The comparatively small number of liberal ministers who chose Christ were soon silenced and forgotten. The Department of Justice saw to it that none were heard, and the denominational headquarters saw to it that no support or recognition were given to them.

But what of those who went with Cæsar? What words and what deeds are theirs now? The war is over and we are one and all living in a new age: (The age of the world after 1914.)

You may see certain signs if you have eyes to see. A liberal minister holding a commission in Christ's Church, while at the same time holding a commission in the Reserve Army, may be the truest "liberal" in that he is like St. Paul, being all things to all men, but this situation is both too clear and too bold not to be recognized as all words.

There is a deeper tendency in the liberal churches that reveals the failure of deeds and the unprofitable fruit of words.

That words fail today in the pulpit, even the blindest reactionary in our churches can see. And what deeds are springing out of the dry ground of words? It does not follow that where words fail in the Church the spirit is dead. Does not the whole world know of the words and deeds of the Friends? It may be a sign of the Spirit struggling for a higher life. Is the liberal church in the "Empire of Silence," as Carlyle calls that spiritual awakening when we lay deeper hold of the things of God? Most liberals in religion want to think so. The contrary seems to be true.

What deeds are springing out of liberalism in religion, it being agreed that words have failed? Are these the signs of the times in religion? Does the mumbling of ritual and the obscurantism of symbols tell us of the passing time in religion? Certainly this tendency is at work in liberal churches.

The symbolism of the dollar sign is so potent when Church symbolism is referred to that one almost instinctively connects the two. It may be that the successful "Drive" for $3,000,000 in a liberal denomination of only 75,000 adherents is a sign of deeds that spring up when words fail. This in the face of the natural prejudice, cultivated for a century, against the "Drive." The "Drive" always has been the method

of Orthodoxy, the ancient enemy of liberalism,—that is, if the latter has any enemies. After the failure of the Inter-Church's money scramble, behold, this liberal denomination out Inter-Churches the Inter-Church in spite of the Steel Corporation checkrein on the latter.

Can it be that this success and the ritualistic tendency observable in liberal churches are one and the same? It reveals a certain kind of deadness—momentum without progress.

In some churches of the liberal persuasion, the communion is observed where it has not been in use before. Most liberals understand where this form was in use a century ago, or since the church was organized; it may not be well to ignore it. But how can the introduction of it, after the World War, be explained? Candles, a lectern, and altars added, with many of the forms and tendencies that go with them, are creeping in. That this is a general tendency cannot be shown. Any liberal minister of experience knows that rites and forms have to creep in. Forms have to shiver on the threshold of most liberal churches long before they can gain admission. Yet rites and forms are in, or waiting at the door.

To a liberal of the Theodore Parker persuasion all this is deplorable. It is the transient taking the place of the permanent in religion. Momentum without progress is the result.

It is not to be noted today that liberal churches are in the front rank fighting for the old institutions of freedom in American life. There are a number of notable exceptions. The stand of Jefferson, Adams and Thomas Paine on the priceless heritage of Democracy are not quoted or given to the press by pulpits alive, when Democracy is in danger. How hungry the Press is for news from a liberal pulpit. Every liberal minister knows the public ear itches to know what new thing is being said. With Channing, Parker, Emerson, Wendell Phillips, Lowell, Abraham Lincoln, and many more whom the liberals claim, burning in heart and soul for the true spirit of American life, their temper of mind seems to be going to seed with—ritualism.

The greatest lesson given by Jesus revealed the connection between words and deeds. A lawyer made a test of Jesus. He wanted to see if Jesus was sound, 100 per cent in his teaching. "How can I gain eternal life?" this lawyer asked. Jesus, being sound in words, asked "What is written in the Law?" Then the lawyer was in his element—words were his forte. "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself!" When it came to deeds the lawyer, like many a minister, was a lame duck. Had he been a good lawyer, perhaps a corporation lawyer, he would never have asked: "Who is my neighbor," after having repeated words about Love and God and Neighbors. Words were not dead with Jesus because deeds were not dead.

Did Jesus say go, collect millions, pass a communion cup, burn candles, secure an altar from some rich member of your church and chant liturgies? No; he told the story that will challenge every liberal church alive today. Pick up the man on the Jericho road, look out for the man and woman who have not been given fair trials or no trials at all during these days of hysteria; be fair to the Communist, I. W. W. and neurotic individual who has got some of the general poison of hate in his system. And, what is more, open the road that no human being henceforth shall suffer without a fair trial in any town or in any place on this earth. Let us begin here!

Go and do thou likewise should ring in the ears of liberalism today. The deeds that speak, now that words fail all the churches, are in opening the minds and hearts of men and women to a New World clamoring to be born. Deeds of understanding, deeds of love, deeds of hope are needed. This does not mean endorsement of every social ism that blows. A baby, said William James, is a "bundle of blooming confusion." That is what is the matter with the world since 1914.

What is liberal religion doing with the baby?

It is most surprising to see some younger men in the liberal denominations steering their course in the channels of ritualism. Young men today, seeing clearly the call to be born anew in a New World Order, ought to be especially alive and wild for God. Youth must be ready to do and dare to open the channels of love and light of freedom; becoming the champion of the weak against the oppressors; the knight of old filled with the spirit of the New Chivalry.

But what will the future say to the young man who loves to gather with shivering age around the fleshpots and take the fawning hand of patronage?

The world wants a living church, a living faith, a cause to suffer for. Like children crying in the wilderness, the hearts of men are set on something higher than they have known before 1914. They may not know where is the kingdom, but they know that what has been is not of the kingdom.

Ritualism, forms, flags, Bibles, coats-of-arms all fail. Where words fail, deeds speak.

ARTHUR B. HEEB.

Centralization of Power in France and Japan

It is one of the great misfortunes of France that the First Republic obliterated the old provinces, breaking up the territory into departments without political significance, thus centering all public life at the capital, where it is under easy control of finance, militarism and a venal press. Conditions in France would be far safer and saner were the republic a federation of provinces, each with some degree of political life of its own. The same observations apply to Japan, in which nation the old provinces for a similar reason were similarly broken up into judicial circuits or *"Ken,"* without reference to ancient boundaries. The purpose in Japan as in France was to facilitate centralization of power, itself a natural foe to the only liberty there is, that is individual freedom.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

It is a striking fact that God is first called spirit in contrast with the material preparedness for war and military alliance (Isaiah 31:3). Though the prophets (therefore) cannot be called absolute non-resistants or pacifists, their clear apprehension of the materialism of war-makers and their firm reliance on the spiriual alternatives to force are not without importance for the modern age.—*Henry J. Cadbury.*

From "National Ideals in the Old Testament."

SELECTED

The Co-operative Movement and World-Problems*

The subject I have been asked to speak to you about is "Co-operation and World-Problems." Now the world-problem which comes before all others and around which all others revolve; the world-problem upon the solution of which depends the creation of that international co-operative commonwealth which is the supreme goal of your movement, is the problem whether the nations of the world are going to find some method of settling their disputes other than the method of war.

If the nations cannot find some method other than war to compose their differences, then the hope of building up an International Co-operative Commonwealth may as well be given up. The Great War killed off by violence, disease and starvation, or mutilated more or less seriously, a population equal in number to the entire population of the United Kingdom—in four and a half years. And we may be sure that the next war, which impolicy is even now preparing, and the strategic and operative details of which are even now being worked out in the secrecy of the military and diplomatic council chamber, in the chemical laboratory, and in the workshops of the great armament firms, will be infinitely more destructive of human life and economic resources than the last.

The horrors of the past six years, and the horrors which millions of men and women are still enduring in many parts of Europe, have burned into the soul of some of us the passionate determination to devote every ounce of physical energy that is in us, and every ounce of intellectual strength we possess, to the destruction of that most terrible and most powerful of all human institutions—the institution of war.

And I am particularly glad that the opportunity has been given me of addressing your Guild because I have long been persuaded that *two of the most potent forces against war* are forces which are both represented in this room today—*womanhood and economic co-operation.*

Properly organized and acting in unison, those forces would in themselves constitute the greatest of human barriers against the most colossal of human errors—which war is.

The abolition of war is not the wild imagining of men who live in a world of dreams. It is realisable. Let us resist with all the strength of our intellect and of our faith the false assertion that war is an inevitable product of human nature. It is not. It is due to unnatural and artificial conditions thrust upon the people, but tolerated by them; conditions which the people can get rid of—when they *will* to get rid of them.

When all the barriers of conventioal hypocrisy are cast down and man is confronted with the frightful realities of modern war, we see how he recognizes the falsity of the alleged inevitableness of war. This was strikingly proved in the Great War from which we have recently emerged. For, as the war dragged on from months into years, what was the popular appeal most frequently used by the politicians to stimulate the endurace of our people?

It was that the struggle was being prolonged *in order that a crushing victory should ensure the final destruction of war.*

Well, we got the crushing victory, but the destruction of war is no nearer than it was in August, 1914. The people were, in the event, deceived by the politicians. Yes; but why? Because the war was crowned by a crushing and vindictive settlement which settles nothing and, indeed, perpetuates war. If the peace settlement had been inspired by a desire to remove the obstacles to a really permanent accord between the nations, a longer step towards the abolition of war could then have been taken than at any previous period in the world's history.

It was not taken, because the peoples were not organized and instructed in regard to world-politics. If they had been the election cry of making Germany pay the costs of the war, "hang the Kaiser," and all the other dishonest nonsense would have fallen upon deaf ears.

The abolition of war lies through a proper understanding of world-problems by the people. I do not mean by that an expert knowledge of the particular and necessarily differing conditions and circumstances of particular states—but a general knowledge of the great arteries which run through the international body and how their functions are disturbed by artificial causes, with the result that the entire international body becomes poisoned.

If we push our investigations into the causes of *modern* war to the very roof, we shall find two responsible agencies at work. One is a material agency. The other is an intellectual or, perhaps, one should say a spiritual agency.

The first is concerned with the exercise of the function essential to the life of all mankind—the function of commercial intercourse, of buying and selling, of the exchange of commodities. In one word, trade.

The moment we look into the manner in which this essential function is exercised we find that *the whole structure of our civilization is spoilt by an immense flaw which runs through it, from base to summit.* And for this reason.

This function of commercial intercourse, of the exchange of goods and services, lies at the base of all normal human activities everywhere—in the complex life of civilized man, as in the relatively simple social life of uncivilized or semi-civilized man.

It necessarily follows that the exercise of this function must influence and eventually determine the POLITICAL action of human groups—to which we give the name of nations, communities, and states.

And it follows that the greatest practical interest of the states and nations into which humanity is divided, lies in facilitating and encouraging in every possible way this function of trade and exchange—this economic relationship as it is called.

You would imagine, then, that one of the main concerns of government in these states and nations would be to assist and to regulate this function of exchange between the people of the state and the peoples of other states.

But what are we confronted with?

We are confronted with the fact that instead of assisting this function of exchange of commodities and services, Governments and particular vested interests have combined to hamper and impede it: to interpose

*Being a speech delivered to the Women's Co-operative Guild at Dundee.

artificial restrictions upon its free evolution, to hedge it round with barriers and obstructions.

And the folly and the tragedy of the thing lie here —that while on the one hand you have a natural and essential human function *common* to all mankind and making, for that very reason, for peace between every section of mankind: you have on the other hand artificial agencies converting that natural and essential function into a cause of rivalry and strife. So much so that a whole vocabulary has come into existence which actually invests the exchange of commodities between nations with an underlying spirit of hostility. We speak of a "trade war," of "trade invasion," of "trade aggression." The language of war is imparted to the transactions of commerce.

Here you have man multiplying himself on this planet, always making discoveries and inventions tending to facilitate human contact, always increasing his desires and needs; annihilating space, removing physical obstacles in order to make his economic activities easier and more fruitful—creating through his actions and his needs an immense natural human force making for international friendship and understanding.

And yet by the most cruel of ironies, this natural, human force making for international harmony and international partnership is not only hampered and arrested in its development, it is actually made into an element of international discord by the tariff, the concession, the monopoly, whereby Governments seek to promote sectional interests at the expense of common interests.

Here you have the astounding contradiction of humanity stretching out for an ever closer economic partnership—because that economic partnership is essential to its necessities, and Governments and sectional interests making of that very desire for partnership an instrument of discord.

Man's freedom to co-operate in the exchange of commodities and services would be one of the surest guarantees of international peace.

Yet you have only to glance at the history of Europe and at the history of Europe's connection with the continents of Africa and Asia for the past fifty years to see how interference, or attempted interference, and the fear of interference with the freedom of the peoples to buy and to sell, to exchange the products of their soil and industries, has kept open old wounds, has created fresh sores, fomented new discords, and generated a general atmosphere which—after keeping Europe in a turmoil of unrest and armaments and inflicting monstrous injustice upon native races—finally culminated in the catastrophe of 1914.

And you have only to look out upon the world today to see that the root cause of the starvation, the misery, the despair afflicting tens of millions of human beings today is to be found in the political instruments which Governments and vested interests have forged since the so-called "peace" which operate to prevent the peoples from resuming—even with the old hampering restrictions—the exchange of the products of their soil and industries.

And it is because the Co-operative movement has grasped the great truth that trade and exchange are the foundation and must always be the foundation of all human relationship, and has founded a movement of immense promise through which the peoples of the world may become more and more closely associated in an economic partnership which shall be *conscious* instead of automatic—an economic trade international —it is because of this *that the Co-operative movement is today the foremost organized agency which is undermining the foundations of the institution of war.*

Let us now pass from the material agency making for war to the intellectual or spiritual.

Two opposing tendencies, two rival schools of thought, are contending for mastery in the modern world. Domination on the one hand, co-operation on the other. Here in this country, the school of domination finds public utterance and expression in the political acts and deeds of the men now holding the reins of power and the influences behind them. For the moment it is their day. They have come out of a great war militarily triumphant. They have added over one million square miles to the British Empire. They are intoxicated with the sense of power. You have only to examine their acts; to study their utterances; to read their newspapers—to realize that domination is the god of their philosophy and the determining factor in their political outlook.

Their ideal is a Britain crushing with remorseless determination every race whose desire for political independence, whose form of government, whose capacity in arts and crafts, appears to conflict with their interpretation of Britain's greatness, or to threaten what they conceive to be Britains interest.

Their ideal is a Britain armed to the teeth, dominant at sea and in the air, holding in her hands the most terrible of all modern weapons of international coercion, the blockade, imposing by force her will upon politically and militarily helpless peoples, raising a vast army of colored legions obedient to her bidding and to be transported hither and thither as circumstances dictate.

Ireland groans beneath their feet bleeding and tortured. India is convulsed from end to end with a passive resistance movement. Arabs in Mesopotamia struggle desperately to throw off a hated yoke. Russia wilts in the iron grip which blocks her trade intercourse with the outer world. Germany is gradually being reduced to the chaos bred of despair under the effects of a treaty which strangles her economic recovery and makes of her an outlaw among the nations.

The crudest of the exponents of this school is Mr. Winston Churchill. To do him justice he does not conceal his convictions under the cloak of hypocrisy as do most of his colleagues. He makes no secret of his views. He glories in them and advertises them on every possible occasion. For the people he does not affect to conceal his contempt—except when the time comes to ask them for votes. Then he will dazzle them with the glories of the Empire, the greatness of the race, its prodominant position in the world, the mighty part they are called upon to play in the world's destinies—cajole them, flatter them, play upon all their prejudices and passions with an experienced hand. But in the interval—well they are a poor lot manifestly unfit to govern, inexperienced, ignorant; fit for cannon fodder.

That is one school. The other speaks to us through the mouths of our thinkers—men like Edward Carpenter, Bertrand Russell, Lowes Dickinson; women like Mary Macarthur, Margaret Bondfield, Margaret Llewellyn Davies—and appeals to us in the political organizations of the Labor Party and the I. L. P. and in the Co-operative movement. Its ideal is a Britain inclining not towards the sterile materialism of Im-

perial Rome, but towards new and loftier conceptions of human progress for the people within her borders, for the peoples now associated with her within her imperial boundaries, and for the peoples outside those boundaries. Its ideal is a Britain which shall wage relentless war not upon man but upon the forces in nature hostile to man; against disease, against preventible social ills, against monopoly and privilege, against an immoral and incendiary Press, against vested interests—raising the broken along life's road, infusing new hope into the hopeless, marching breast-high in the van of a new brotherhood of the nations. It looks to a Britian which by her open dealing, by her moral force, by the integrity of her purpose, shall lead the states of the world to substitute law for force, the court for the battlefield, peace and equity for war and injustice.

To which school of thought will the womanhood of Britain rally? Upon the answer to that question depends the future of our country, the salvation of our children—perhaps the salvation of the world.

It is between those two schools that the next General Election will be fought. Here in this city the issue will be clear and unmistakable. I am stating what is my sincere conviction when I say that an honest British Government and a British Parliament composed of honest and earnest men is what this distracted world needs most of all, if it is to be saved from calamities even more appalling than those which have befallen it in the past six years.

Olive Schreiner once wrote:

> That day when the woman takes her place beside the man in the governance and arrangements of external affairs of her race will also be that day that heralds the death of war as a means of arranging human differences.

May it be so.

For the school of thought incarnate in the forces that are now in the ascendant among us mean war—war always latent, ever threatening to burst out into catastrophic activity.

And against war, against the causes and the tendencies making for war, the attitude of womanhood should surely be an attitude of open challenge, an attitude of incessant protest, a call for continuous activity in opposition.

Hitherto woman could oppose her tears to the great self-inflicted affliction of mankind. Today, in this country at least, woman can oppose her political power.

Will she use it in favor of national policies creative of international friction and war, or in favor of national policies creative of international harmony and peace?

Will she use it—use it actively and fully—to rid the world of a plague which destroys the home, the family—and woman herself?

Will she do it here—here in this city which is linked with the lives of countless peoples all over the earth?

Will woman *realize* her *power?*

What an immense new field of beneficent work lies before womankind in this country!

How woman's practical common sense and intuition—if only they be deliberately applied—can be brought to see what so many men fail to perceive, that war, and the preparation for war which goes on all the time, which is going on now at ruinous expense; that the policies and the systems and the personal ambitions which lead to these preparations; that all this senseless paraphernalia of imperialism and grab—that these things do not merely involve the issues of life and death for men and women and communities—but the most ordinary issues of every day life!

There is not a working family in Dundee which is not suffering today from the fact that competition leading to war, instead of co-operation leading to peace, is the operative force in the national and international body. And it is the woman upon whom the daily effects bear most hardly.

It is the woman who has to go through the harassing anxiety of meeting the bills for food and necessaries; for rent.

To Dundee women particularly the nature of our relations with other peoples, which is determined by the imperial and foreign policy of our rulers, and upon which our industrial activities depend, comes with special force for a special reason.

According to the last census report the proportion of women householders in Dundee is larger than in any other Scottish town, and the proportion of "occupied" women over fifteen is the highest in Scotland, being no less than 50 per cent., and—above all—the staple industry of the town is a woman's industry.

Now the prosperity, nay the very existence, of the jute industry depends upon two things, a regular flow of the raw material out of which the finished article is made, and markets in which to dispose of the finished article. Both these things may be permanently endangered, the first by our Indian policy, and the second by our international policy.

And we all know that the international policy of the Government has gravely affected the jute industry, and that if thousands of jute operators are out of work today, this is chiefly due to the closing of the Russian markets and the non-recovery of the German markets—which are the result of the Cabinet's Russian policy and the result of the conditions imposed upon Germany, Austria and Hungary in the peace treaty.

What is not yet so apparent, but is becoming more so every day, is that the state of grave disaffection in India is likely, if it continues, to affect very materially our general trade with India, and therefore to hit the staple industry of Dundee at the Indian end.

And this last consideration serves to illustrate what I have been endeavoring to demonstrate to our working class population for a long time, viz.: that if our workers have a proper regard for their own interests they must not only have a proper regard for *the interests of their white fellow-workers* in other European lands, but their fellow colored workers too. Our workers cannot if they have a proper regard for their own interests, adopt the attitude that the lot of the colored peoples of the Empire, or in regions where the British Government has contracted definite treaty obligations towards the native inhabitants, is no concern of theirs.

They cannot, for this if for no other reason: that there is not a working class family in this land that does not consume, or use, every day the products of the labor of colored peoples—our tea, coffee, cocoa, our margarine, our various nut butters, our soap, our candles, are all produced by the labor of colored peoples—just as the jute, the cotton, the rubber, the various cabinet woods, and a host of other articles, the handling of which gives employment to hundreds of thousands of men and women in this country, are produced by the labor of colored people; an additional proof, if any were needed, that we are all members of

one great human family, of which each member is dependent upon half a dozen others.

When these truths are better understood by our workers, when this inter-dependence of peoples is more surely appreciated by them, they will realize that those who defend the interests of the colored peoples (who are mostly powerless to defend their own cause) are defending the interests of Labor where Labor is weakest and are therefore defending Labor at home.

I would like to close by saying this:

As I remarked before, the Co-operative movement is of its very essence a great force working for international peace. It can become an even greater one if it will use its *political* power with the same energy and determination as it is displaying in creating what I hope will become in time a real *economic* league of peoples.

But the development of an international Co-operative *economic* movement is necessarily advanced or hindered by political action. Co-operators must learn more and more that the policies and actions of the Government towards foreign States are a matter of domestic interest to them, also that the ideal of the world-wide co-operative commonwealth can be indefinitely retarded by a vicious foreign and imperial policy.

The co-operative movement can build itself upon nothing less than international peace.

And international peace cannot be secured so long as a country's foreign policy escapes—as is the case with us—democratic control. So long as our Government can commit us secretly behind our backs to policies making for war, we cannot as citizens, as co-operators, as workers, do anything effective to guide our country into the paths of international peace.

That is the lesson that the Union of Democratic Control, which I helped to found in 1914, has been ceaselessly striving to put before the workers for the past six years. I hope some of you here in Dundee may be induced through this meeting to come into closer contact with this organization.

To the rank and file of the Co-operative movement I would venture to say this in conclusion:

Remote as they may appear to you, these great questions of international and imperial policy operating at the ends of the earth are able to make or mar the home, the shop, the factory life of this your own city upon the Tay.

You must study them. You must seek to understand them in your own most vital interests. And, believe me, they are not in themselves nearly so difficult to understand as you are led to think.

The key to the solution of all of them is to be sought and found in the ideal, the realizable ideal, of co-operation—and in cultivating among ourselves a patriotism purged of its narrowness and intolerance, a patriotism which shall look beyond the confines of its now limited horizon, which shall realize that in every land the same dawn rises upon joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, common to all mankind. —*E. D. Morel.*

"The simple fact is that humanity has been fast outgrowing the forms, institutions and beliefs that have been handed down from the past. The garments of a nineteenth century civilization are no longer suitable to, nor do they fit, the life of today. For man himself has been constantly growing and changing far more rapidly than have the forms of the civilization under which he lives his life."—*Rev. J. H. Randall.*

THE STUDY TABLE
"The Lost Oracles"

THE LOST ORACLES. By James Westfall Thompson. Walter M. Hill: Chicago.

"Beauty is truth, truth beauty." When comparative religion gets out of the hands of the pedant and the fact collector and finds its place in the realm of vital poetic thought, something has happened. Here is evidence. For this is a book where the old cults of Egypt, Babylon, Tyre, Phrygia, Persia, Hellas and Rome come to us with something of their old beauty restored to them by a creative imagination to which all the human past is full of fascinating enchantment.

"Not religions but religion," said Schiller, and this volume may be said to be written on that text. But there is no prose in the sermon. The scheme of the whole is a vision and the introductions to its various scenes are prose poems in themselves. Mr. Thompson (a professor of history) here reveals himself to us, as such, in a new sense; for this history has the poetic value which, could we only feel it, belongs to everything which was once part of the miracle of human experience. The "pagan superstitions" of the theologian have here been refashioned in the inner world of one to whom the past has become a living reality.

Obviously this product of the dreamland which is truth is not for the believer in one infallible revelation of which he is the unhappy possessor. But to all those who take delight in the opening of ever wider horizons, and to whom the growth of religions, as an outcome of the upward striving urge of all that is, appeals as a true evangel, this attempt at restoration of "The Lost Oracles" will prove full of charm.

That it is crowded with facts and that it presupposes untiring research, lovingly undertaken, is obvious on a first superficial glance. The important thing, however, is that these are only the crude materials out of which has been wrought something of the beauty which Keats declared was truth.

This "Masque," as the author calls it, is thus not only a joy to the lover of beautiful things but an incentive to intelligent appreciation of the slowly emerging fact that there are no "heathen" to the child of the open air, where the human spirit, escaping from the closed cell of a system, finds itself at home.

CONTRIBUTOR.

Social Legislation

SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN ILLINOIS: Needs and Opportunities in 1921. By Seba Eldridge, Professor of Economics and Sociology, Rockford College. W. M. Shimmin & Co., Rockford, Ill. 110 pages.

Professor Eldridge brings to the problems of this book a wealth of practical experience gained during service as special agent of the New York Charity Organization Society and Secretary of the Social Betterment Department of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities.

The book's usefulness is in no sense limited to Illinois, for its suggestions and careful study of social needs and conditions are valuable to all states alike, and it is doubtful if any state yet has all the desirable social legislation which this book recommends. It covers many fields; that of provision for the feeble-minded, adequate child welfare laws, needed reforms in penal institutions, educational needs, laws to prevent disease, laws regulating child labor and the la-

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

HOW WE WON EQUAL SUFFRAGE IN SOUTH INDIA.

South India has taken a great step toward democracy. April 1, the Madras Legislative Council passed a resolution giving *equal suffrage to the women* of the Madras Presidency. A great deal of work had been done by the women previous to this. Notification of the resolution was given early in February by the prime mover, Dewan Bahadur M. Krishna Nair. The resolution was as follows:

"This Council recommends to the government that the sex disqualification prescribed in Rule 7 of the Madras Electoral Rules for registration on the electoral roll be removed in respect of women and that the qualifications which entitle men to vote be made applicable to women."

From this time a great educational campaign was waged in Madras led by the Women's Indian Association. We got up public meetings in the different centers of Madras which were attended by large numbers of women. The meetings in the Georgetown District were specially enthusiastic, the women there not considering the vote sufficient but wanting to be allowed to stand for the Legislative Councils. One woman even suggested that if the resolution did not get through the Council the women of Madras should immediately start militant methods. In the Provincial Districts also several meetings were held and resolutions passed asking that the sex disqualification be removed and the Krishna Nair resolution passed.

A letter was sent by the W. I. A., signed by representative women, to all the Council members asking them to support the resolution, also various deputations were arranged to meet the members of the Cabinet. The first one was the Hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Iyengar, Minister for Law. After that the Hon. Rao Bahadur K. Venkata, Reddi Nadu, Minister for Development, and later the other two Ministers, also received a deputation. It was interesting to notice the difference in the reception of our deputations here from the way the Suffrage deputations were received in England. There hordes of police came out to prevent the women approaching the Minister and the women were arrested and thrown into prison. Here, in India, everything was done to make it easy for the members of the deputation, the Ministers receiving us with the utmost courtesy and friendliness, listening with grave attention to all the arguments put forth and seriously and earnestly asking questions to gain the women's point of view. After the business of the deputation refreshments were offered to the members!

We also received an invitation to visit the Cosmopolitan Club, which is the chief men's club in Madras, where reside many of the Council members. We went there and met many of the members of the Legislative Council and they asked as questions and presented their difficulties. We had a long and most interesting and instructive conversation. Private members, of course, were also interviewed and asked to support the resolution when it came up. I wrote a short pamphlet embodying quite briefly all the anti-suffrage arguments, which was given to every member, and it was interesting to visit the Council Chamber and see this little pamphlet everywhere in the House and members sitting in the Chamber reading it! We found little serious opposition save from the Mohammedans. Great interest was shown, especially as it is a new thing for women in modern times to go forward and definitely take an active part in asking for some reform of this sort. The day of the debate a large number of women assembled in the Council Chamber. Two galleries in the best position in the House were reserved by the President of the Council for the use of women only. The debate lasted two hours and a half and most excellent speeches were delivered. At the beginning of the discussion Sir Lionel Davidson announced on behalf of the government that the government, as such, would remain neutral, members being free to vote as they pleased, though he himself was against the vote being given to women, considering it premature. This latter argument was most ably answered by Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandara Rao in the course of the debate. The fact that members were left free helped us considerably, as if the government had ordered its followers to vote against the Resolution some of the members would have done so even against their own convictions. The large majority of the Hindu members spoke for the resolution. The only serious opposition came from the Mohammedans, who all voted against the resolution, though they had no arguments against it except that they wanted the women left alone. Their leader even wished that an amendment should be introduced especially to exclude Mohammedan women, which fortunately was not even brought up.

Great excitement prevailed in the House at the time of division, which resulted in 47 voting for the Resolution, 13 against and 10 remaining neutral. It is a splendid victory for Madras women and we are very proud of ourselves to be the first Presidency to grant the suffrage to women. We also felt convinced the Indian Legislative Councils would on being asked without much opposition accord suffrage to women. There is very little opposition here in India to women obtaining anything, if they really want it. Of course, there are customs and prejudices to be overcome and many reforms needed; but if once a woman really *demands* that something shall be done, that thing is done. I am sure that the men of India will not oppose any desired progress on the part of women, if they earnestly ask for it.

We hope the Bombay Presidency will also give the suffrage to women during the hot weather session at Poona. The resolution was brought up a short time ago in Bombay; but a clause was introduced asking that women should be Legislative Councilors. As the Councils have no power to grant this, the resolution had to be declared out of order. I think there is no doubt that next time the resolution is brought up it will pass.

In the Purdah districts of India matters will not be quite so easy, as there the demand on the part of the women is not great and the leading women are many of them working in the Non-co-operation movement. In the three Indian States the suffrage has already been given to women. In Travancore, one of the most important of the Indian States, in Cochin, also an important State, women are to be admitted to the Legislative Councils in addition to their being enfranchised. The smaller State of

---

bor of women, minimum wage and sickness insurance laws, adequate housing and building laws, and a general reform of the interrelations of state, city and county governments.

The section on Labor conditions seems especially deserving of attention, for not until such basic provision for the mere physical welfare of workers is made can any state claim to call itself civilized. In Illinois, as in so many other states in the union, the provisions regarding child labor fall far short of the standard recommended by the Children's Bureau, both as to the ages at which children may be employed, the kinds of work they may do, the amount of schooling required, medical examination and other important points. Despite the fact that the United States Supreme Court has upheld the eight-hour working day for women as essential to the maintenance of their health and the vigor of the race, Illinois permits longer hours than any other state in the union except eight. Industrial accident, old age insurance and sickness insurance laws are recommended and the reasons for their passage given.

The method of the book is thoroughly scientific. In each department studied, the conditions existing in the state, the present laws and their good or bad points, and the recommendations of social experts in that particular field are carefully set forth, followed by a recommendation as to the amending of existing laws or the passage of new ones to remedy the evil. A brief bibliography follows each chapter. A very complete summary is given so that the desired legal changes may be seen at a glance. We feel sure that social agencies throughout the country will find the book of great value. SUSAN QUACKENBUSH.

Jahalwar has also enfranchised the women. So we are now in South India in a better condition than are our English sisters, as here we have equality in the franchise with men and in England they are still suffering from limitations. This rather explodes one of the old arguments that used to be used in England against giving the English women the vote, that "the people of India would not tolerate that women send representatives to the House of Commons which governed India."

Dorothy Jinarajadasa.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....